UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,594	09/26/2000	Prasad Raje	004426.P001	5001

8791 7590 03/16/2010

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER	
BASEHOAR, ADAM L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/669,594	RAJE, PRASAD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ADAM L. BASEHOAR	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *126-129,131-140,142 and 144-154* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *126-129,131-140,142 and 144-154* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 12/16/09.

2. All previous rejections the claims have been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.

3. Claims 126-129, 131-140, 142, and 144-154 are pending. Claims 126, 132, and 137, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 126-129, 131-140, 142, 144-147, and 150-154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong (US-6,167,523 12/26/00) in view of Lindhorst et al (US-6,268,852 07/3101) in further view of Hitchcock et al (US-7,376,891 05/20/08).

-In regard to substantially similar independent claims 126, 132, and 137, Strong teaches a computer-implemented method, server system, and machine-readable medium comprising:

receiving a form authored by a form authoring tool and containing one or more input fields (Fig. 2: 210, 245, 280; Fig. 3A-C; 5)(column 1, lines 12-56; column 3, lines 12-47);

parsing, independently of the form authoring tool, the received form to identify the input fields contained in the received form (column 3, lines 12-47; column 5, lines 1-4; column 6, lines 23-31; column 8, lines 1-10)(Figs. 3B & 5);

providing, independently of the form authoring tool, a user interface dependent upon the identified input fields to enable specification and configuration of one or more actions to be carried out in response to a subsequent specific submission of the form by a third party, the submission including data input into the input fields by the third party, wherein the graphical user interface association of actions from a group of two or more types of actions and allows for the configured actions to be dependent upon data input during submission of the form (column 1, lines 14-36: “forms may be provided for many different purposes…data processing program”; column 3, lines 7-47: “performing validation and controlling processing”; column 5, lines 1-4 & 39-54: “registry wizard…assist in registry configuration…multiple handlers”; column 6, lines 32-49: “first server registry key identifier"; column 8, lines 1-11 & 32-55: "software program...form of a wizard...automatically...based on user responses...enters the information required"; column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5: “handlers can be added to perform any variety of processing tasks...data processing support can be easily customized")(Fig. 5: “VALIDATION”, “HANDLER1”, “HANDLER2”);

automatically generating, independently of the form authoring tool, program code to carry out the one or more actions (column 1, lines 14-36: “forms may be provided for many different purposes…data processing program”; column 3, lines 7-47: “performing validation and

controlling processing"; column 5, lines 1-4 & 39-54: "registry wizard…assist in registry configuration…multiple handlers"; column 6, lines 32-49: "first server registry key identifier"; column 8, lines 1-11 & 32-55: "software program...form of a wizard...automatically...based on user responses...enters the information required"; column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Fig. 5: "VALIDATION", "HANDLER1", "HANDLER2");

wherein the program code is external to the form and independent of the form authoring tool (column 1, lines 46-67; column 2, lines 10-15, column 3, lines 11-32, column 4, lines 62-67; column 5, lines 1-12 & 39-45; column 6, lines 31-42l column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Figs. 1, 2, 5);

receiving the specific submission of the form from the third party (column 3, lines 7-47: "remote client")(Fig. 4: 400); and

executing the program code in response to receipt of the specific submission of the form from the third party to carry out the one or more actions (column 3, lines 7-47: "each field...evaluated...one or more data processing programs...are invoked by the data validation and processing control program to process the input data")(Fig. 4: 420, 435, 450).

As described above, Strong teaches a software program wizard user interface that automatically configures for a form, one or more actions from a group of two or more actions based on user responses to predetermined questions for a specific set of forms (column 1, lines 26-34; column 5, lines 39-56: "data validation and processing…multiple handlers are used to process a single form…implemented in a different manner"; column 7, lines 41-67: "HTML forms file includes or is associated with three or more configuration subkeys...evaluate the input data...resolve the HTML variable names...how to process input data"; column 8, lines 1-11:

"provides support for a specific set of forms…based on user responses to predetermined questions"; column 10, line 45-column 11, line 5: "handlers…can be added to perform any variety of processing tasks simply by entering the handler filename…processing support can be easily customized"). While Strong broadly defines a specific form wizard interface for entering form validation and processing subkeys, Strong does not specifically teach providing a graphical user interface to enable the specification and configuration of one or more actions to be carried out wherein the GUI allows for the selection of actions and includes the identified input fields, and allow for configured actions to be dependent upon the data input during the form submission. Lindhorst et al teach a method for parsing a received HTML form document (column 11, lines 57-65: "document is parsed in order to separate the objects, HTML text, and scripts"; column 13, lines 1-14: "HTML document is fed into HML parser"; column 13, lines 39-column 14, line-20: "<FORM>…<TEXTAREA>")(Fig. 3: 106, 110; Fig. 4: 210, 211) and providing a user a graphical user interface depending from and including identified input fields of the form (column 2, lines 35-63: "user interface...display a graphical representation of objects, events, and actions…'event' pane includes a list of objects from the HTML document that have events which can be triggered...scriptable HTML tags...second 'action' pane of the user interface includes a list of objects from the HTML document that provides actions"; column 3, lines 25-33: "data-type specific dialog boxes are displayed to allow the user to set properties associated with the objects"; column 6, lines 1-30: "event pane"; column 7, lines 34-column 8, line 2: "action pane")(Figs. 1 & 2), the graphical user interface enabling the specification and configuration of one or more actions selected from a group of two or more actions to be dependent on the data input during the form submission (column 2, lines 30-67: "user can

generate and edit…user interface...display a graphical representation of objects, events, and actions…'event' pane includes a list of objects from the HTML document that have events which can be triggered...scriptable HTML tags...second 'action' pane of the user interface includes a list of objects from the HTML document that provides actions…response to mouse clicks on the objects"; column 3, lines 25-33: "data-type specific dialog boxes are displayed to allow the user to set properties associated with the objects"; column 6, lines 32-67: "user selects on an event in the event pane"; column 7, lines 34-column 8, line 11: "an action listed in the action page is selected"; column 12, lines 1-34: "user selects an object in the event pane...event may be selected...object is chosen in the action pane...object and associated event have been chosen...script is generated")(Figs. 1, 2, 3: "124, 125, 128, 140, 150). Additionally, the Lindhorst et al reference also teaches automatically generating program code to carry out the one or more actions (column 2, lines 30-35 & 64-67: "user can generate and edit…scripts…without typing in or directly editing the underlying script code" & "program automatically generates a script"; column 3, lines 32-40: "event handler scripts are generated automatically in response to selection of events and associated actions"; column 4, lines 5-11)(Figs. 1 & 3: 140, 150). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the interface of Strong for entering/selecting the validation and processing procedures of HTML forms to have included the features and functionality of the HTML document editing graphical user interface as shown in Lindhorst, because Lindhorst taught by providing said graphical user interface a user could easily generate and edit event scripts without writing a single line of code and without learning the syntax of the underlying programming language (column 2, lines 30-35: "user can generate and create…without typing in or directly editing the underlying script code";

column 3, lines 33-41: “even a novice user can add creative scripts”; column 4, lines 5-11: “without writing a single line of code…without knowledge). The system of Strong recognized said coding problem (column 1,lines 38-56: ‘coding may be time and resource intensive") and thus in view of Lindhorst, Strong could more easily customize the processing actions to be specified for data entered into any given form (column 10, line 67-column 11, line 5).

While Strong teaches a user interface for customizing a given form (column 3, lines 12-47; column 5, lines 1-4; column 6, lines 23-31; column 8, lines 1-10; column 11, lines 1-5), Strong does not specifically teach wherein the forms stored at the server were received through a network from an independent authoring tool and wherein the form could be independently edited. Hitchcock et al taught wherein forms stored at a third party server were received through a network from an independent authoring tool and wherein the form could be independently edited (column 2, lines 10-30; column 4, lines 7-65; column 5, lines 35-55; column 53-61; column 9, lines 1-7: “application description file can be easily modified…without reprogramming the forms engine”; column 10, lines 48-67; column 11, lines 1-50; column 20, lines 60-67)(Figs. 1 & 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the HTML forms system of Strong to have incorporated the forms functionality as detailed in Hitchcock, because Hitchcock taught said functionality provided a plurality of well known benefits (column 2, lines 1-7 & 24-59: “allows data sharing between customizable forms…extensible data-sharing database…news forms are automatically populated…stored in a way that allows…user information to be changed without reprogramming”; column 8, lines 1-6; column 14, lines 56-67: "reduces the requirements for the browser...less computation is performed").

In regard to dependent claims 127, 134, 138, Strong teaches wherein the form was written in HTML (column 3, lines 7-31)(Fig. 2: "HTML form").

In regard to substantially similar dependent claim 128, 135, 139, Strong teaches wherein the generated program code was a CGI program (column 1, lines 25-67; column 5, lines 39-45: "CGI").

In regard to dependent claims 129 and 140, Strong teaches modifying the form such that the specific form submission is directed/associated to the generated program code (column 5, lines 1-4 & 49-52; column 6, lines 32-49; column 8, lines 1-10; column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Fig. 3B: 350).

In regard to dependent claims 131, 136, and 142, Strong teaches automatically determining whether the generated program code is consistent with the form and generating an alert if the generated program code is not consistent with the form (column 7, lines 32-40)(Fig. 4: 405, 410).

In regard to dependent claim 133, Strong teaches a processor implementing the parser module, configurer module, and the code generation module (Figs. 1, 2, & 4).

In regard to dependent claim 144, Strong teaches validating that submission data is consistent with constraints for the form input fields as configured in the GUI (column 1, lines 40-67; column 3, lines 8-46: "validation", column 8, lines 28-52).

In regard to dependent claim 145, Strong teaches generating one or more quantities computed from data in the specific submission (column 1, lines 12-19; column 8, lines 28-55; column 10, lines 5-45).

In regard to dependent claim 146, Strong teaches generating one or more licenses in response to the specific submission of the form (column 1, lines 12-19; column 6, lines 6-15; column 8, lines 28-55; column 10, lines 5-45)(Fig. 3A).

In regard to dependent claim 147, Strong teaches generating one or more cookies for each user who submits a specific submission of the form (column 1, lines 12-19; column 6, lines 6-15; column 8, lines 28-55; column 10, lines 5-45)(Fig. 3A).

In regard to dependent claims 150-151, Strong teaches generating response pages/preserving a state of data to the third party upon receipt of the specific submission form, wherein the response page, having one or more fields in common with the first form, depends on the value of submission data provided by the third party in the form input fields and wherein the response page contains one or more strings of fixed text and one or more strings that are

dependent on the submission data (column 1, lines 12-37; column 3, lines 37-47; column 10, lines 13-50)(Fig. 7).

In regard to dependent claims 152-154, Strong a plurality of different form functions and a plurality of processing handlers for processing the data submitted on the form (column 1, lines 12-18: "gathering…information…creating guest books"; column 5, lines 39-53; column 6, lines 7-14; column 8, lines 1-56; column 10, lines 54-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Fig. 5). Strong does not specifically teach wherein the function of the form was to log values for data submitted in the specific submission of the form in a database in a single row of a table, different submission corresponding to different rows of the table. Hitchcock et al taught wherein the function of an HTML form could be to log values for data submitted in the specific submission of the form in a database in a single row of a table, different submission corresponding to different rows of the table (column 9, lines 32-67: " a first database table…each attribute, such as Name…SAT score…is represented by one row…User Attributes Table"; column 10, lines 5-34: "User Attribute Sent Table…multiple records"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the processing functionality of one of the forms in Strong to have been to store data as shown in Hitchcock et al, because Hitchcock et al taught that said data storage functionality provided the ability of extensible data sharing between customizable forms (column 2, lines 1-7 & 24-59: "allows data sharing between customizable forms…extensible data-sharing database…news forms are automatically populated…stored in a way that allows…user information to be changed without reprogramming").

6. Claims 148-149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong (US-6,167,523 12/26/00) in view of Lindhorst et al (US-6,268,852 07/3101) in view of Hitchcock et al (US-7,376,891 05/20/08) in further view Whitmyer (US-5,895,468 04/20/99).

In regard to dependent claims 148-149, Strong teaches entering a valid email address into a HTML form (Fig. 3A) and returning one or more elements of data from the specific form submission of the form and including in the message one or more strings of fixed text and one or more strings that are dependent on the submission data (column 1, lines 12-37: "provide for the output…displayed to the client…from which the form was submitted"; column 3, lines 37-47; column 10, lines 13-50)(Fig. 7). Strong does not specifically teach wherein the returned form specific message was returned to the client by emailing said form based on said entered email address. Whitmyer teaches wherein an action based on a form submission resulted in a response message being emailed back to a given user and/or third party (column 4, lines 31-67: "response form...by email...and generate a reply email….computer network, etc"; column 5, lines 1-6 & 43-60; column 6, lines 40-50: "automatically generating a confirmation email based on the action...transmitting...to the client computer"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the output message of Strong to have been returned to the client of Strong via an email as shown in Whitmyer, because email was a notoriously well known method at the time of the invention by which information could quickly/easily be passed over a network between devices as well as because Whitmyer taught that said functionality provided the benefit of improving the speed, efficiency, and reliability of performing services for clients (column 2, lines 15-35: "speed…reliability").

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Please note the additionally cited prior art on the accompanying PTO-892 Form.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ADAM L. BASEHOAR whose telephone number is (571)272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178